

Remarks

1. Summary of the Final Office Action

In the Final Office Action mailed September 30, 2008, the Examiner rejected claims 1-3, 5, 7-10, 14-16, 18-20, 35-57, 58, 60-65, and 69-75 under 35 U.S.C § 102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by U.S. Patent Application Pub. No. 2001/0046366 (Susskind). The Examiner also rejected claim 6 under 35 U.S.C § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Susskind in view of U.S. Patent No. 7,124,356 (Alsafadi), and rejected claims 11-13, and 66-68 under 35 U.S.C § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Susskind in view of U.S. Patent Application Pub. No. 2007/0240181 (Eldering).

2. Status of the Claims

Presently pending are claims 1-3, 5-16, 18-20, 35-57, 58, 60-65, and 69-75, of which claims 1, 35, 58, and 60 are independent, and the remainder are dependent. Various claims have been amended as follows.

Applicants have amended claim 1 to recite a plurality of web portals. Specifically, the actions recited in the claim apply to any one of a plurality of web portals. Support for this amendment can be found generally throughout the original specification at specifically at least in Fig. 2 and at page 20, paragraph [0074], in which an exemplary embodiment of the servers 28 are described as communicatively coupled with the “integration system.” The front end is a distinct element from servers 28, which are examples of web portals (cf., page 30, paragraph [0093]).

Applicants have amended claim 3 to ensure consistent antecedent basis with base claim 1.

Applicants have also amended each of independent claims 35, 58, and 60 in a manner similar to that of claim 1.

Finally, Applicants have amended each of claims 19 and 20 to correct a minor typographical error. Specifically, a space was added between “claim” and “1.”

No new matter has been added by way of any of the above amendments.

3. Response to Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e)

The Examiner rejected claims 1-3, 5, 7-10, 14-16, 18-20, 35-57, 58, 60-65, and 69-75 under 35 U.S.C § 102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by Susskind. Applicants respectively traverse. Under M.P.E.P. § 2131, a claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference. Applicants submit that Susskind fails to teach each and every element set forth in any of claims 1-3, 5-16, 18-20, 35-57, 58, 60-65, or 69-75. Applicants first direct their discussion to claim 1, and then subsequently address claims 2-3, 5-16, 18-20, 35-57, 58, 60-65, and 69-75.

Susskind does not teach or suggest “providing an Application Program Interface (API) located remotely from each of the plurality of web portals, each given one of which, in operation, permits data retrieved from at least one database concerning the media-based device to fit a format associated with the given web portal.”

Susskind discloses a system for controlling operation of a remotely located video recording device includes at least one Video Recording Device connected to the Internet; at least one Internet access device connected to the Internet; and at least one Internet Remote Control Server connected to the Internet, whereby the Internet access device can control the Video Recording Device. In particular, Susskind teaches (paragraph [0035]) that the Internet access device communicates with an “Internet Web Site Host” that provides HTML pages that simulate the Video Recording Device. Susskind further teaches (paragraph [0036]) that the Internet Remote Control Server provides information to the Internet Web Site Host.

Even *if* the Internet Web Site Host were, for the sake of argument, considered analogous to the web portal recited in claim 1 (a supposition that Applicants submit is not supported),

Susskind does not teach or suggest a plurality of Internet Web Site Hosts. At most, Susskind teaches *one* Internet Web Site Host. Applicants submit that for at least this reason, claim 1 distinguishes over Susskind, and is therefore allowable.

Each of independent claims 35, 58, and 60 include, *inter alia*, elements similar to the limitation of claim 1 discussed in the preceding paragraphs herein. Applicants submit therefore that claims 35, 58, and 60 similarly distinguish over Susskind, and are allowable as well.

Each of claims 2-3, 5, 7-10, 14-16, 18-20, 36-57, 60-65, and 69-75 depend, in one way or another, from one of claims 1, 35, or 60, all of which are allowable for at least the reasons discussed above. Applicants submit that for at least the reason that they depend from an allowable claim, claims 2-3, 5, 7-10, 14-16, 18-20, 36-57, 60-65, and 69-75 are allowable as well. Further, Applicants do not concede any of the Examiner's specific assertions with respect to claim 2-3, 5, 7-10, 14-16, 18-20, 36-57, 60-65, and 69-75.

4. Response to Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Each of claims 6, 11-13, and 66-68 depends, in one way or another, from one independent claim 1 or 60, both of which are allowable for at least the reasons discussed above. Applicants submit that for at least the reason that they depend from an allowable claim, claims 6, 11-13, and 66-68 are allowable as well. Further, Applicants do not concede any of the Examiner's specific assertions with respect to claim 6, 11-13, and 66-68.

5. Conclusion

Applicants submit that the application is in good and proper form for allowance and therefore respectfully request favorable reconsideration. If, in the opinion of the Examiner, a telephone conference would expedite the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned at 312-913-3353.

Respectfully submitted,

**McDonnell Boehnen
Hulbert & Berghoff LLP**

Date: December 29, 2008

By: /David A. Grabelsky/
David A. Grabelsky
Reg. No. 59,208